

REMARKS

With this Response, claims 1, 17, 28, 33, and 37 are amended. No claims are added or canceled. Therefore, claims 1-37 are pending.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claim 37 was objected to under 37 CFR § 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Appropriate correction is made herein by amending claim 37 to depend from claim 36.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-10, 17-30 and 33-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0205104 of Harvey et al. (hereinafter "Harvey"). Of these claims, 1, 17, 28, and 33 are independent claims. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are not anticipated by the cited reference for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 as amended herein recites the following:

defining a virtual interface that selectively exposes methods and parameters of a specific Web service implementation to provide an interface for the specific Web service implementation that **provides multiple views for the Web service;**

creating a Web service definition generically defining features and properties of the Web service to specify a behavior of the defined virtual interface, the generically defined features and properties mapped to runtime technical features in the specific Web service implementation; and

providing a Web service archive including the virtual interface and the Web service definition.

Claims 17, 28, and 33 recite similar limitations directed to defining a virtual interface that selectively exposes methods and parameters of a specific Web service implementation, and an interface that provides multiple views for the Web service.

As Applicants have understood the reference, Harvey discusses a distributed UDDI approach, where virtual registries are linked back to a single main registry. The registry includes a business level description (e.g., to enable recognition of a service from a user search) and a description of interfaces that enable an application to access a Web service. See Abstract, pars. [0076], [0084]. Applicants note that as will be understood by one skilled in the art, the interfaces

described in the UDDI are fixed, and reference a single particular implementation of a Web service registered in the UDDI. Were the interfaces not fixed in the UDDI registry described in Harvey, Applicants submit that the Web service would be inaccessible to applications that accessed the registry to seek a Web service. That is, the particular Web service would be inaccessible if the registry did not provide the specific interfaces for the particular Web service. The view of Web service is thus unitary and static within the registry of the cited reference.

In contrast, Applicants' independent claims recite features directed to a virtual interface that selectively exposes methods and parameters of a specific Web service implementation, and an interface that provides **multiple views** for the Web service. Thus, Applicants submit that the discussion of the distributed UDDI registry scheme of the cited reference fails to disclose or suggest at least one feature of the invention as recited in the independent claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the reference cannot support an anticipation rejection of the claims, per MPEP § 2131.

Regarding the remaining claims, these claims depend from independent claims shown above to be novel over the cited reference. Because dependent claims necessarily include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicants submit that these claims are patentable over the cited reference for at least the reasons set forth above.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 11-16, 31, 32, 36 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harvey in view of the BEA WebLogic Server 6.1 as described by "Web applications Basics" (BEA Systems Website, "Web Applications Basics," accessed 21 June 2007, published 2001), hereinafter BEA1, and in further view of "web.xml Deployment Descriptor Elements" (BEA Systems Website, "web.xml Deployment Descriptor Elements," accessed 21 June 2007, published 2001), hereinafter BEA2. Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are not rendered unpatentable by the cited references for at least the following reasons.

The independent claims as amended herein are shown above to be patentable over the primary reference, Harvey. To support a rejection under obviousness, the combination of the references must disclose or suggest every element of the claimed invention. Thus, in the instant case, Applicants submit that BEA1 and/or BEA2 must be shown to cure the deficiencies of

Harvey. Applicants respectfully submit that they do not, but rather are similarly deficient. The BEA references discuss various aspects of Web service design, specifically setting out several elements of Web services. However, the references fail to disclose or suggest the virtual interface as discussed above, and as recited in each of Applicants' independent claims. Thus, the secondary references suffer at least the same defects as the primary reference. As such, the references alone or in combination fail to disclose or suggest at least one feature of the claimed invention, and so fail to support an obviousness rejection of the independent claims. See MPEP § 2143. Furthermore, these dependent claims are patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons set forth with respect to the independent claims.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, all pending claims are in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: October 1, 2007

/Vincent H. Anderson/
Vincent H. Anderson
Reg. No. 54,962
Attorney for Applicant

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(503) 439-8778